codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 9 **CX/PR 08/40/9**
March 2008

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES
Fortieth Session
Hangzhou, China, 14 - 19 April 2008

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES

(Prepared by Australia)

A. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE 2008-2014

1. The tentative schedule for evaluations and re-evaluations by the FAO/WHO JMPR is shown at Appendix 1. Information regarding the tentative schedule is provided below. Members and observers are invited to comment on the schedule and the associated issues noted for consideration (**in bold text**).

B. NEW COMPOUNDS

2. Four new compounds have been nominated for inclusion on the tentative schedule (Appendix 1) for 2009 (2) and 2010 (2).

2009:

3. The United States has proposed two new compounds.

4. Metaflumizone is a novel insecticide developed by BASF for the control of insect pests in fruiting vegetables, leafy vegetables, brassica crops, citrus, tree nuts, grapes and potatoes. Codex MRLs are sought for tomato, pepper, eggplant, lettuce, spinach, broccoli, cabbage, orange, grapefruit, lemon, almond, walnut, pistachio, grapes and potatoes.

5. Clopyralid is a broad spectrum selective broad leaf herbicide developed by Dow Chemicals. The herbicide is absorbed into the leaves and roots of weeds in grass, cereals, oil seed rape, sugar beet and hops crops.

2010:

6. The United States has proposed etoxazole a contact acaricide used to control spiders and mites in cotton, tree fruits, nuts, vines and ornamentals. Etoxazole was developed by Sumitomo Chemical Co. US EPA has designated etoxazole a reduced risk profile with low hazard to non-target organisms including honeybees, predatory mites and insects.

7. The United Kingdom has proposed meptyldinocap which is a resolved isomer of the existing active substance dinocap. Approximately 22% of dinocap is meptyldinocap. Meptyldinocap has been developed by Dow AgroSciences to replace dinocap once it has received global registrations. When compared to

dinocap it has a reduced overall toxicity, for example lower mammalian toxicity resulting in higher toxicological endpoints (ADI and NOEL). Major uses include pome fruits, stone fruits, grapes, strawberries, cucurbits with edible and inedible peel.

8. All four new compounds have registrations for use in a member country; are available for use as a commercial product; and give rise to residues in or on a food or feed commodity moving in international trade.

9. Sponsoring countries have indicated that relevant data packages are or will be available prior to the scheduled year of JMPR evaluation.

10. Member countries and observers are asked to endorse the placement of these new chemicals on the tentative schedule.

C. FOLLOW-UP EVALUATIONS

11. Requests were made for several follow-up evaluations largely for additional MRLs. Further details are provided in Appendix 1. The chemicals added to the evaluation schedule are:

2008: ethoxyquin and malathion (USA)

2009: zoxamide (USA), indoxacarb (USA) and paraquat

2010: fenpyroximate (Japan)

12. Member countries and observers are asked to endorse the placement of additional follow-up evaluations to the tentative schedule.

D. PERIODIC RE-EVALUATIONS

13. Following a review of the CCPR chemical list in terms of the fifteen year rule for periodic re-evaluations, sixteen chemicals were listed on the tentative schedule for periodic re-evaluation (see Appendix 1).

14. Decisions on the scheduling of the sixteen chemicals, last reviewed in 1993 or earlier, were based on member country / manufacturer preferences and the period of time elapsed since the last JMPR review.

15. The table in Appendix 2 has been further refined to enable use as a working document to keep track of the initial JMPR evaluation, most recent JMPR periodic evaluation and forthcoming scheduled periodic re-evaluation for toxicology and residues. From this table, nine chemicals which were last reviewed in 1994 (and are italicised in Appendix 2) will need to be considered for placement on the tentative schedule for periodic re-evaluation at CCPR41.

16. In responding to the EWG email request, one manufacturer indicated no support for two chemicals disulfoton (74) and dichlofluanid (82). This is discussed in more detail in Section F of this paper.

17. Given the number of commodity data packages to evaluated for tebuconazole (189) [evaluation for additional MRLs scheduled for 2008], the USA has suggested that this chemical be scheduled for periodic evaluation as soon as possible. Subject to the manufacturer's decision / approval, tebuconazole has also been tentatively scheduled for periodic re-evaluation in 2009.

18. Member countries and observers are asked to endorse the placement of 16 existing chemicals for periodic re-evaluation on the tentative schedule.

E. REPLACING RACEMIC CHEMICALS WITH RESOLVED ISOMERS

19. There are a number of racemic chemicals which are in the process of being replaced by respective resolved isomers. Two current examples are metalaxyl (138) / metalaxyl-M (212) and fenvalerate (119) / esfenvalerate (204). In both cases, the recommended MRLs for the resolved isomers are currently being held

at Step 6 of the Codex procedure pending further information on the phase out of metalaxyl and fenvalerate and revocation of CXLs.

20. At the CCPR38 and the CCPR39, the Committee discussed consultation with member countries on support for the existing chemicals metalaxyl and fenvalerate. Noting ALINORM 07/30/24 (Report of the 39th session of CCPR) paragraphs 100-102 (metalaxyl) and paragraphs 117-119 (fenvalerate), the Committee agreed to request information from Codex members and observers regarding the support for metalaxyl and fenvalerate. At CCPR39, the Committee noted that neither compound appeared to be supported and agreed to consider revocation of CXLs at CCPR40. At that time, recommended MRLs for metalaxyl-M and esfenvalerate at Step 6 would be advanced to Step 8.

21. Member countries and observers should be aware that both metalaxyl (138) and fenvalerate (119) meet the fifteen year rule for periodic re-evaluation and have been tentatively scheduled for 2012. In regard to metalaxyl, the CCPR39 agenda paper CX/PR 07/39/3 records that metalaxyl was subjected to periodic re-evaluation for residues in 2004. This does not appear to have been the case as the 2004 new chemical evaluation was in fact for metalaxyl-M.

22. Member countries and observers should also be aware that there is a range of metalaxyl CXLs for which there are no corresponding metalaxyl-M MRLs. Further, where there are corresponding MRLs, the draft MRLs for metalaxyl-M are much lower than the metalaxyl CXLs. The same applies for the CXLs and draft MRLs for fenvalerate and esfenvalerate.

23. The USA has indicated support for fenvalerate. The USA has suggested CCPR ask JMPR to use all fenvalerate core studies submitted to JMPR in support of esfenvalerate (2002) as many of the studies (toxicology and residue chemistry) used for esfenvalerate were in fact conducted with fenvalerate. The USA has indicated it will provide additional field trial studies conducted by IR4. The USA has indicated support for metalaxyl. The USA has suggested CCPR ask JMPR to use all metalaxyl core studies submitted to JMPR in support of metalaxyl-M (2002) as many of the studies (toxicology and residue chemistry) used for metalaxyl-M were in fact conducted with metalaxyl. The USA has indicated it will provide additional field trial studies conducted by IR4. Both compounds have been scheduled for periodic re-evaluation (toxicology 2012 and residue 2013).

24. It would appear appropriate to flag a similar scenario for dinocap with the nomination of its resolved isomer meptyldinocap to the new chemicals schedule for 2009.

25. Member countries and observers should give consideration to obtaining manufacturer support for dinocap.

F. CHEMICALS DUE FOR PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION AND NO LONGER SUPPORTED BY COMPANIES / SPONSORS

26. During out-of-session work conducted by the Electronic Working Group of Priorities in regard to scheduling of chemicals for periodic re-evaluation under the 15 year rule, the relevant manufacturer indicated no future support for the chemicals dichlofluanid (82) and disulfoton (74).

27. In the past two years, a similar situation arose with respect to vinclozolin and fentin.

28. If CCPR is advised of no manufacturer support for a compound due for periodic re-evaluation, this is noted in the report along with words to the effect that the CXLs will be considered for withdrawal the following year. This process was followed in the case of fentin (refer to para 62 of the 38CCPR Report). The extra year gives manufacturers, including alternative manufacturers, and member countries the chance to register support for the periodic re-evaluation. If there is firm commitment for support, then the compound can be scheduled for review and the existing CXLs remain on the 'books' under the 3 year rule.

29. This general issue has been discussed at the 2007 meeting of the JMPR (see Appendix 3).

30. In 2007, the CCPR39 did not follow this process in the case of vinclozolin. Vinclozolin was temporarily removed from the periodic re-evaluation schedule given the advice received from the

manufacturer at CCPR39. Subject to a commitment for support, the compound could be returned to the schedule for the next 3 years awaiting presentation of the appropriate data package.

31. The USA has indicated support for vinclozolin (159). The USA will provide agency reviews and field trial studies generated by IR4.

32. As an interim measure, dichlofluanid and disulfoton were placed on the tentative schedule for 2012 (toxicology) and 2013 (residues) pending further consideration by CCPR.

33. The USA has indicated support for disulfoton (074). The USA will provide agency reviews and field trial studies generated by IR4.

34. Late advice has been received from the manufacturer that bioresmethrin (93), scheduled for periodic re-evaluation in 2008 (toxicology) and 2009 (residues), and permethrin (120) scheduled for periodic re-evaluation in 2008 (residues) are no longer supported.

35. Member countries and observers are asked to give clear indications of support for bioresmethrin (93), permethrin (120), and dichlofluanid (82), with information on the supporting manufacturer and data packages.

G. NEW DEADLINES FOR DATA SUBMISSION FOR THE RESIDUE EVALUATION OF JMPR

36. At the CCPR 39**,** the Committee agreed to establish new deadlines for the data submission for residues. The new deadlines will become effective from 2008, onwards these including:

a) The Data Directory for residue, data of the compound should be available by 1 September (starting in 2008 for the 2009 JMPR;

b) The full submission of all residue data is required by 30 November (starting in 2010 for the 2011 JMPR);

37. Member countries and observers are asked to comply with these new deadlines accordingly.

H: MODIFICATION OF THE PRIORITISATION CRITERIA

38 Member countries and observers will recall that at the 39th CCPR, the United States introduced a conference room document (CRD25) which discussed the need to modify the prioritization criteria so that pesticide compounds with no residues on commodities in trade could be placed into the schedule (ALINORM 07/30/24 – rev 1, paragraph 200):

> **Modification of the Prioritization Criteria**
> 200. The Chair of the Working Group informed the Committee that the Working Group had discussed a proposal by the US presented in CRD 2520 to amend the prioritization criteria to reflect that some new low hazard chemicals although not leading to detectable residues in agricultural products, might still need JMPR assessments in order to establish Codex MRLs. After some discussion the Committee agreed not to amend the criteria at this session, but give further consideration to the potential need for amendment at its next session.

39. The USA proposed a modification to the criteria to allow scheduling of compounds with no residues onto the priority list. The proposed wording is in footnote 20 of ALINORM 07/30/24 – rev 1 and is as follows (italics added):

> iv. must give rise to residues in or on a food or feed commodity moving in international trade, the presence of which is(or may be) a matter of public health concern and thus create (or have the potential to create) problems in international trade; *or may give rise to residues that are not detectable for which it is deemed appropriate to establish Codex standards which demonstrate that no residues are expected (to avoid the potential for creating problems in international trade as the result of the lack of a standard).*

40. The prioritization criteria at present contain a requirement that the pesticide result in finite residues on food/feed items in trade. Thus, a pesticide that yields residues below the limit of quantitation (LOQ) of the analytical method would not qualify for review and addition to the Codex list of MRLs. The apparent reasons for this requirement are (1) pesticides that do not yield residues on commodities in trade cannot be monitored for unauthorized uses (and cannot therefore lead to international trade problems); (2) JMPR resources are limited and should be used for compounds with real residues.

41. The USA believes that, in practice, this requirement runs counter to the purposes of Codex, namely, to protect the safety of consumers as related to food in international trade and to promote fairness in international trade of food and feed. The requirement for the existence of residues denies consideration to the potentially safest of all pesticides, those with no residues. The (*) designation after the particular MRL entry will inform them that no residue is expected when used according to GAP.

42. The second concern is the best utilization of JMPR resources. The JMPR is burdened with a backlog of periodic reviews, and the review of new compounds with no residues will further delay the periodic review process. This diversion of resources can be minimized by the utilization of work sharing. At least for the residue aspects, the use of two of more national reviews could form the basis of the FAO JMPR review. As there are no residues, the FAO Panel might default to the national reviews for metabolism, analytical methods, storage stability, environmental fate, and residue definition considerations.

43. Accordingly, in order to promote the use of these no residue compounds for products to be sold in international trade rather than the avoidance of use of these compounds, the USA requests that the CCPR give due consideration to removal of the no residue requirement for nomination.

44. Australia has suggested a slight amendment to the USA proposal to split the suggested fourth criteria into two parts with the additional ‘no residues’ text becoming the fifth criteria. The current fourth criteria would therefore remain unchanged. In doing so, the list of criteria can be viewed as a hierarchical scheme where compounds which give rise to residues in a food or feed commodity are given a higher priority.

45. Member countries and observers are asked to consider proposed modifications to the prioritisation criteria with a view to seeking Committee agreement at CCPR40.

Appendix 1

Tentative Schedules For Evaluation And Re-Evaluation By JMPR

2008 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
azoxystrobin	azoxystrobin
chlorantraniliprole	chlorantraniliprole
mandipropamid	mandipropamid
prothioconazole	prothioconazole
spinetoram	spinetoram
spirotetramate	spirotetramate
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
bioresmethrin (093) – not supported	buprofezin (173)
buprofezin (173)	lambda-cyhalothrin replacement of cyhalothrin
hexythiazox (176)	cypermethrins (118)
	permethrin (120) - FAO advise not supported
	profenofos (171)
Evaluations	**Evaluations**
carbofuran (096) – review of ARfD (new US data available)	bifenazate (219) - manufacturer to provide additional information on MRLs for citrus fruit, egg plant, tea, water melon
oxamyl (126) – clarification of ARfD (concern of EC)	boscalid (221) - tentative listing for additional MRLs – hops and kiwifruit
	chlorpropham (201) - whole milk and milk fat MRL evaluation
	dimethoate(027) –retrospective alternative GAPs: cabbages, head; lettuce, head; peppers sweet
	diphenylamine (30)- whole milk and milk fat MRL evaluation
	imidacloprid (206) – additional MRLs for avocado, banana, blueberry, cranberry, carrot, coffee, pea, peanut, pomegranate, strawberry, sugar apple, sunflower, tree nuts
	methomyl (094) – retrospective alternative GAPs for cucumber, pear, melons, tomato, grapes and zucchini.
	oxamyl (126) – to evaluate retrospective alternative GAPs for citrus fruits, cucumber, melon, pepper and tomato.
	spinosad (203) – additional MRLs for banana, cranberry, hops.
	malathion (49) – wheat (post-harvest)
	ethoxyquin (35) -pears
	tebuconazole (189) - Citrus fruit, pome fruit, plum, elderberry, mango, papaya, leek, onion, garlic, head cabbage, brussel sprouts, broccoli, melon, watermelon, tomato, lettuce, bean, soya, carrot, artichoke, celery, barley, rice, maize, rape, coffee, hops, peanut

2009 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
fluopicolide	fluopicolide
spirodiclofen	spirodiclofen
pyroxsulam	pyroxsulam
metaflumizone	metaflumizone
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
bifenthrin (178)	benalaxyl (155)
cadusafos (174)	bioresmethrin (093) – not supported
chlorothalanil (081)	haloxyfop (194)
chlorpyrifos-methyl (090)	chlorpyrifos-methyl (090)
cycloxydim (179)	hexythiazox (176)
tebuconazole (189) – subject to manufacturer's decision	procymidone (136)
	tebuconazole (189) – subject to manufacturer's decision
Evaluations	**Evaluations**
	acephate – alternative GAP (mandarin, flower head brassicas) – further information for additional commodities expected from manufacturers. Note: Further information for additional commodities expected from manufacturers
	fenbuconazole (197) – re-evaluation of the pome fruits CXL; additional CXLs for almonds, blueberries, citrus, cranberries, plums and prunes
	indoxacarb (216) – additional MRLs for stone fruit (peach, plum, cherry, nectarine), vegetables cucurbits, cranberry, southern pea and mint.
	methoxyfenozide (209) – additional MRLs for bean, blueberry, citrus, cucurbits, papaya, pea, peanut, root crops, strawberry, sweet potato
	paraquat (57) – rice
	phorate (112) – acute intake for potatoes
	prochloraz (142) – acute intake for mushroom
	spices – additional MRLs
	zoxamide (227) – cucurbits (based on new USA GAP)

2010 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
dicamba	dicamba
clopyralid	clopyralid
meptyldinocap	meptyldinocap
etoxazole	etoxazole
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
aldicarb (117)	amitraz (122)
dicofol (026)	azinphos-methyl (002)
dithianon (028)	bifenthrin (178)
fenbutatin oxide (109)	cadusafos (174)
vinclozolin (159) – support from USA	chlorothalanil (081)
	cycloxydim (179)
	vinclozolin (159) – support from USA
Evaluations	**Evaluations**
	fenpyroximate (193) – re-evaluate data for grapes following JMPR recommended new ARfD.
2011 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
dichlorvos (025)	aldicarb (117)
diquat (031)	dicofol (026)
etofenprox (184)	dithianon (028)
fenpropathrin (185) maybe earlier pending data availability	fenbutatin oxide (109)
glufosinate-ammonium (175)	
Evaluations	**Evaluations**

2012 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
triforine (116)	triforine (116)
bentazone (172)	dichlorvos (025)
dinocap (87)	diquat (031)
dichlofluanid (82) – not supported by the manufacturer	etofenprox (184)
disulfoton (74) – support from USA	fenpropathrin (185)
fenvalerate (119) – support from USA	glufosinate-ammonium (175)
metalaxyl (138) – support from USA	
tecnazene (115)	
Evaluations	**Evaluations**
2013 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
bromopropylate (70)	bentazone (172)
bromide ion (47)	dinocap (87)
diazinon (22)	disulfoton (74) – support from USA
hydrogen phosphide (46)	dichlofluanid (82) – not supported by the manufacturer
	fenvalerate (119) – support from USA
	metalaxyl (138) – support from USA
	tecnazene (115)
Evaluations	**Evaluations**

2014 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
abamectin (177)	bromopropylate (70)
myclobutanil (181)	bromide ion (47)
methidathion (51)	diazinon (22)
penconazole (182)	hydrogen phosphide (46)
Evaluations	**Evaluations**
2015 JMPR	
Toxicological evaluations	**Residue Evaluations**
New Compounds	**New Compounds**
Periodic re-evaluations	**Periodic re-evaluations**
	abamectin (177)
	methidathion (51)
	myclobutanil (181)
	penconazole (182)
Evaluations	**Evaluations**

Appendix 2

Periodic Re-evaluations

Code	Chemical	Initial JMPR evaluation	Periodic re-evaluation most recent	Scheduled (Toxicological)	Scheduled (Residues)	notes
7	captan	1963	2000R			
8	carbaryl	1965	1996T, 2002R			
27	dimethoate	1965	1996T, 1998R			
32	endosulfan	1965	1998T, 2006R			
48	lindane	1965	2002T, 2003R			
49	malathion	1965	1997T, 1999R			
53	mevinphos	1965	1996T, 1997R			
59	parathion-methyl	1965	1995T, 2000R			
62	piperonyl butoxide	1965	1995T, 2001R			
63	pyrethrins	1965	1999T, 2000R			
105	dithiocarbamates	1965	1993R, 2004 propineb			Individual dithiocarbamates are evaluated, propineb in 2004, ferbam/ziram (1996)
30	diphenylamine	1969	1998T, 2001R			
35	ethoxyquin	1969	1998T, 1999R			
37	fenitrothion	1969	2000T, 2003R			
41	folpet	1969	1998R			
56	2-phenylphenol	1969	1999			
64	quintozene	1969	1995			
15	*chlormequat*	*1970*	*1994*			
20	2,4-D	1970	1996T, 1998R			
57	paraquat	1970	2003T, 2004R			
65	thiabendazole	1970	1997R			
67	cyhexatin	1970	(2003T), 2005R			
39	fenthion	1971	1995			
17	chlorpyrifos	1972	1999T, 2000R			
60	*phosalone*	*1972*	*1994R*			
72	carbendazim	1973	1995T, 1998R			
79	amitrole	1974	1998R			
83	dicloran	1974	1998			
84	dodine	1974	2000T, 2003R			
85	fenamiphos	1974	1997T, 1999R			

Code	Chemical	Initial JMPR evaluation	Periodic re-evaluation most recent	Scheduled (Toxicological)	Scheduled (Residues)	notes
86	pirimiphos-methyl	1974	2003R			
94	methomyl	1975	2001			
95	acephate	1976	2002T, 2003R			
96	carbofuran	1976	1996T, 1997R			
100	methamidophos	1976	2002T, 2003R			
101	pirimicarb	1976	2004			
102	maleic hydrazide	1976	1996T, 1998R			
103	phosmet	1976	1994T, 1997R			
106	*ethephon*	*1977*	*1994R*			
110	imazalil	1977	2000T			
111	*iprodione*	*1977*	*1994R*			
112	phorate	1977	2005			
113	propargite	1977	1999T, 2002R			
133/168	triadimefon / triadimenol	1979	2004T, 2007R			
129	azocyclotin	1979	2005R			
126	oxamyl	1980	2002			
135	deltamethrin	1980	2000T, 2002R			
130	diflubenzuron	1981	2001T, 2002R			
132	methiocarb	1981	1998T, 1999R			
143	triazophos	1982	2002T, 2007R			
142	prochloraz	1983	2001T, 2004R			
144	bitertanol	1983	1998T, 1999R			
149	ethoprophos	1983	1999T, 2004R			
145	carbosulfan	1984	1997R			
147	methoprene	1984	2001T 2005R			
148	propamocarb	1984	2005T, 2006R			
151	dimethipin	1985	1999T, 2001R			
156	clofentezine	1986	2005T, 2007R			
157	cyfluthrin	1986	2006T, 2007R			
158	glyphosate	1986	2004			
160	propiconazole	1987	2004T, 2007R			
162	tolylfluanid	1988	2002			
165	flusilazole	1989	2007			
166	oxydemeton-methyl	1989	1998R			
167	terbufos	1989	2003T			
169	cyromazine	1990	2006T, 2007R			

Code	Chemical	Initial JMPR evaluation	Periodic re-evaluation most recent	Scheduled (Toxicological)	Scheduled (Residues)	notes
187	*clethodim*	*1994*	*none*			
188	*fenpropimorph*	*1994*	*none*			
189	*tebuconazole*	*1994*	*none*			
190	*teflubenzuron*	*1994*	*none*			
191	*tolclofos-methyl*	*1994*	*none*			
192	fenarimol	1995	none			
193	fenpyroximate	1995	none			
195	flumethrin	1996	none			
196	tebufenozide	1996	none			
197	fenbuconazole	1997	none			
199	kresoxim-methyl	1998	none			
200	pyriproxifen	1999	none			
201	chlorpropham	2000	none			
202	fipronil	2000	none			
203	spinosad	2001	none			
204	esfenvalerate	2002	none			
205	flutolanil	2002	none			
206	imidacloprid	2002	none			
207	cyprodinil	2003	none			
208	famoxadone	2003	none			
209	methoxyfenozide	2003	none			
210	pyraclostrobin	2004	none			
211	fludioxonil	2004	none			
212	metalaxyl-M	2004	none			
213	trifloxystrobin	2004	none			
214	dimethenamid-P	2005	none			
215	fenhexamid	2005	none			
216	indoxacarb	2005	none			
217	novaluron	2005	none			
218	sulfuryl fluoride	2005	none			
219	bifenazate	2006	none			
221	boscalid	2006	none			
222	quinoxyfen	2006	none			
223	thiacloprid	2006	none			
220	aminopyralid	2007	none			
118	cypermethrin	1979	2006T		2008	

Code	Chemical	Initial JMPR evaluation	Periodic re-evaluation most recent	Scheduled (Toxicological)	Scheduled (Residues)	notes
120	permethrin	1979	1999T		2008	FAO advise not supported
146	lambda-cyhalothrin	1984	2007T		2008	
171	profenofos	1990	2007T		2008	
136	procymidone	1981	2007T		2009	
155	benalaxyl	1986	none		2009	
194	haloxyfop	1995	2006T		2009	
2	azinphos-methyl	1965	2007T		2010	
122	amitraz	1980	1998T		2010	
93	bioresmethrin	1975	none	2008	2009	
173	buprofezin	1991	none	2008	2008	
176	hexythiazox	1991	none	2008	2009	
90	chlorpyrifos-methyl	1975	1991	2009	2009	
81	chlorothalonil	1974	1993R	2009	2010	
174	cadusafos	1991	none	2009	2010	
178	bifenthrin	1992	none	2009	2010	
179	cycloxydim	1992	none	2009	2010	
159	vinclozolin	1992	1995	2010	2010	Support from USA
26	dicofol	1968	1992	2010	2011	
109	fenbutatin oxide	1977	1993R	2010	2011	
117	aldicarb	1979	1994R	2010	2011	
180	dithianon	1992	none	2010	2011	
25	dichlorvos	1965	1993	2011	2012	
31	diquat	1970	1994R	2011	2012	
175	glufosinate-ammonium	1991	none	2011	2012	
184	etofenprox	1993	none	2011	2012	
185	fenpropathrin	1993	none	2011	2012	
116	triforine	1977	1997T	2012	2012	
119	fenvalerate	1979	none	2012	2012	Support from USA
138	metalaxyl	1982	2002T	2012	2012	Support from USA Review in 2004 for residues was for evaluation of metalaxyl-M
82	dichlofluanid	1969	none	2012	2013	Support unknown
87	dinocap	1969	none	2012	2013	
74	disulfoton	1973	none	2012	2013	Support from USA
115	tecnazene	1974	none	2012	2013	

Code	Chemical	Initial JMPR evaluation	Periodic re-evaluation most recent	Scheduled (Toxicological)	Scheduled (Residues)	notes
172	bentazone	1991	none	2012	2013	
22	diazinon	1965	1993	2013	2014	
46	hydrogen phosphide	1965	none	2013	2014	
47	bromide ion	1968	none	2013	2014	
70	bromopropylate	1973	1993	2013	2014	
51	methidathion	1972	1992	2014	2015	
177	abamectin	1992	none	2014	2015	
181	myclobutanil	1992	none	2014	2015	
182	penconazole	1992	none	2014	2015	

Chemicals with extraneous MRLs and recent deletions (Source: CX/PR 07/39/3)

Code	Chemical	Last toxicological evaluation	Last residue evaluation		comment
33	endrin	1992	1970	EMRL	
1	aldrin and dieldrin	1992	1977	EMRL	
12	chlordane	1984	1986	EMRL	
43	heptachlor	1994	1991	EMRL	
21	DDT	2000	2000	EMRL	
52	methyl bromide	1992	1968	PART A3	
114	guazatine	1980	1978	PART A3	
40	fentin	1994	1991	none	Not supported - Removed 2007

Appendix 3

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

World Health Organization

JMPR Report 2007

Excerpt of the General Considerations

Item 2.2

Codex MRLs for Compounds No Longer Supported by Companies/Sponsors

When a pesticide is scheduled under the Periodic Review program for review, the entire toxicology and residue chemistry data bases must be supplied to the JMPR by the sponsors, usually the manufacturer(s). Recently two scheduled periodic reviews could not be conducted because companies declined to support the review and to supply the necessary studies to FAO and WHO. Vinclozolin and permethrin had to be removed from the JMPR schedules because toxicology or residue studies, respectively, were not provided. In other instances, only partial data packages were submitted, for example, support of only one isomeric mixture of a pesticide marketed as two or more different isomeric mixtures.

The JMPR recommendations are based only on the results of the scientific assessment of the data supplied. The Meeting cannot make recommendations for maximum residue levels in the absence of sufficient data, both toxicology and residue. The importance of complete data submissions was addressed by the 2006 JMPR (General Consideration 2.1, JMPR Report 2006). It is the prerogative of the CCPR to accept or reject those recommendations, including recommendations to withdraw previous maximum residue levels, suitable for use as MRLs. The CCPR has the option to consider other factors that it deems appropriate in retaining MRLs.